

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are offered in complete response to the Office Action dated September 26, 2007. In light of these remarks, reconsideration of the requirements and examination of all of the claimed subject matter on the merits are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-42 are now in this application.

Claims 1-34 were previously presented. Claim 4 has been cancelled in this amendment. Claims 35-42 are newly added.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite proper claim language for a process claim and to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4. Support for this amendment is found in previous claim 4, which has been cancelled in this response. Claim 2 has been amended to delete reference to derivatives of the recited compounds. Claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 1, rather than cancelled claim 4, and to remove language related to previously recited "advantageous" or "preferable" claim language. Claim 6 has been amended to remove dependence from claim 4, which has been cancelled, and to recite proper claim language. Claim 8 has been written in independent form and parallels claim 1. Claim 9 has been amended to recite the formulas for the silicone oil; to incorporate the definition of  $R^T$  from claim 5; to recite that the ranges of integers for the variables  $r$ ,  $q$ ,  $s$  and the sum of  $q+r+s$  are from the integers of the recited ranges; and to remove unnecessary claim language. Claim 9 previously recited in part:

$r$  is an integer between 1 and 10, limits included;  
 $q$  is 0 or an integer between 1 and 9, limits included; and  
 $s$  is 0 or an integer between 1 and 9, limits included,  
the sum  $q + r + s$  being between 4 and 10, limits included.

The phrase "limits included" was meant to recite that the upper and lower limits for each of these variables are included in the allowed value of the variable. For example, the phrase "r is an integer between 1 and 10, limits included" was meant that the value of r is an integer from 1 to 10 and includes the integers 1 and 10. This phrase was intended to distinguish the allowed range of r from an interpretation of the phrase "r is an integer between 1 and 10" as requiring that r can only be the integers 2-9. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and to recite proper claim language. Claims 12 and 14 have been amended to depend from claim 1 and to recite proper claim language. Claims 15 and 20 have been amended to recite proper claim language and to remove "preferable" claim language. Claim 16 has been amended to remove claim language reciting "such as". Claim 17 has been amended to recite proper Markush group language. Claims 18 and 19 have been amended to depend from claim 1 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 19 has also been amended to remove "preferable" claim language. Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 19 and to define  $R^5$  as is defined in claim 1. Claim 22 has been amended to depend from claim 21 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and to remove "preferable" claim language. Claim 24 has been amended to depend from claim 36 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 25 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 27 has been amended to depend from claim 37 and to recite proper claim language. Claims 28-30 and 31 have been amended to recite proper claim language. Claim 32 has been amended to depend from claim 37 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 33 has been amended to depend from

claim 32 and to recite proper claim language. Claim 34 has been amended to recite proper claim language.

Claims 35-42 have been added. Claim 35 recites that step a), activating a siliceous compound, is carried out in a medium comprising a polar solvent. Support for this claim is found in the specification at least on page 4, lines 7-9. Claim 36 depends from claim 35, and recites a Markush group of specific solvents. Support for this claim is found in the specification at least on page 4, lines 7 – 16. Claim 37 recites that claim 1 can further comprise the step d) of separating and isolating the product of the coupling reaction. Support for this amendment is found on page 4 lines 4-6 of the specification. Claim 38 depends from claim 16 and recites specific examples of compounds of formula (IIb). Support for this amendment is found in the previous version of claim 16 and on page 9 lines 21-27 of the specification. Claim 39 depends from claim 5 and recites specific examples of the R group. Support for this amendment is found in previous version of claim 16 and on page 13 lines 9-15 of the specification. Claim 40 depends from claim 20 and recites preferred embodiments of  $Y^3$  and  $Y^4$ . Support for this amendment is found in previous version of claim 20 and on page 29 lines 4-9 of the specification. Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and recites preferred embodiments of  $Y^3$  and  $Y^4$ . Support for this amendment is found on page 29 lines 4-9 of the specification. Claim 42 depends from claim 8 and recites the amount of catalyst present. Support for this amendment is found on page 31 lines 13-25 of the specification.

No new matter has been added in these amendments.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 6, 7 and 11-34 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claims.

Claims 6, 7 and 11-34 have been amended to depend from a single claim, rendering this objection moot. Applicants therefore request the withdrawal of this objection.

**35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph Indefiniteness Rejection**

Claims 4, 5, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which that applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 has been rejected for reciting a broad recitation of halogen atoms and also claiming preferred halogens. Claim 4 has also been rejected for reciting a definition of RT and also reciting a narrower definition of RT. Claim 4 has also been rejected for reciting the phrase "the  $R^T$  radical defined above" and for reciting the phrase "for example".

Claim 4 has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

Claim 5 has been rejected for reciting a broad recitation of alkyl radicals and also claiming preferred narrower groups of alkyl radicals. Claim 5 has also been rejected for reciting the phrase "for example".

Claim 5 has been amended to recite definitions only comprising one range for each of the variables defined and does not recite the phrase "for example".

Claim 9 has been rejected as allegedly being indefinite because the phrase "limits included" is not clear.

Amended Claim 9 recites in part:

r is an integer from 1 and 10;  
q is 0 or an integer from 1 and 9; and  
s is 0 or an integer from 1 and 9,  
the sum  $q + r + s$  being from 4 and 10,.

Amended claim 9 is not indefinite because the amended claim recites that the outer limits are included in the allowed range.

Claim 10 has been rejected as being indefinite because it depends from an indefinite claim. Amended claim 9, from which claim 10 depends, is not dependent. Therefore this rejection is moot.

Applicants therefore request the withdrawal of these rejections.

### **35 U.S.C. §102 rejections**

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Denmark et al. (US 2002/0183516).

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP 2131).

Denmark et al. teach the claimed process for creating a carbon-carbon bond by coupling a transferable group to an acceptor group can comprise a halide. The claims of the instant application require the use of a dihalosilane. Therefore claims 1-3, 5 and 8-10 are not anticipated by Denmark et al.

Applicants requested the withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that entry of the proposed amendments should be allowed and that the record rejections cannot be maintained against the proposed claims once entered into this application. Further, favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 26, 2007

By: /Gary Mangels/  
Gary D. Mangels, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 55424

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620